

thing is very clear. The people who are pushing this, had they been contemporaries of Thomas Jefferson wouldn't have been great fans of his.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I think it does disservice to the importance of this issue of religious freedom that out of 435 Members of the House, we are debating it in 1 hour, something Mr. Madison and Mr. Jefferson spent 10 years debating in the Virginia legislature. We are debating this in 1 hour, with 4 or 5 Members of the House on this floor. I think that, frankly, in my book, is a sacrilege.

There is no greater principle in American democracy than religious freedom. It is the first freedom upon which all other freedoms are built. If one thinks government involvement in religion protects religious freedom, then I would suggest you vote for this ill-advised and dangerous piece of legislation. If one agrees with our Founding Fathers, with the Bill of Rights, the first 16 words thereof, with Mr. Madison and Mr. Jefferson, that the greatest threat to religious freedom in this world is government intrusion into religion, I would suggest you vote "no" on this legislation.

This legislation is a direct effort to make it more difficult to enforce the Bill of Rights, and that is wrong. That is why we should vote "no."

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests for time, and I reserve my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Texas for making clear what this bill is trying to do, which is to undermine the Constitution. It is frightening to see what could potentially happen should the other side gain seats in the next election.

I also think it is frustrating and I think it is offensive that we all know this bill is going nowhere and that we are taking our time up debating this when we should be debating ways to improve the quality of life for our veterans and raising the minimum wage and a whole bunch of other things.

One final thing. We have heard the word democracy mentioned several times over there. All the rules in this Congress that have been reported out by the Rules Committee, with the exception of appropriations bills, have been closed, with the exception of one bill. It is about time we had a little democracy in this House of Representatives.

If you respect the Constitution and you respect this institution, we need to have a different process.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to once again thank Mr.

HOSTETTLER for sponsoring the Public Expression of Religion Act and Chairman SENSENBRENNER for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the principles of life, liberty, and property make up the foundation of our constitutional Republic. Under liberty, we are guaranteed the freedom to worship as we please, a freedom that should be protected and not taken for granted. The freedom of religion is one of the positive social institutions in our country, and we should encourage this constitutional protection throughout the world.

□ 1130

Almost every State in the Union has chosen to acknowledge God within its State constitutions. However, too often today, overzealous courts have infringed upon an individual's right to worship. Courts have attempted to ban holiday decorations reflecting religious traditions such as Christmas carols or Hanukkah songs from school events. Federal courts have demanded the removal of the Ten Commandments from courthouses across our country, sought to remove the words "in God we trust" from our currency, as well as remove emblems from State seals, flags and logos.

As I stated earlier, these attacks on our religious heritage are frivolous and unwarranted. For every decision a court makes, there are countless out-of-court settlements and even more pending lawsuits aimed at removing anything that acknowledges a divine authority.

The debate over religious freedom is old and contentious, but it should be fair. When organizations like the ACLU are rewarded, rewarded, for filing lawsuits, it is not a fair debate. Congress needs to close that loophole, to restore impartiality to our system of justice, and it needs to act on preventing frivolous lawsuits. H.R. 2679, the Public Expression of Religion Act, will help protect the freedom of religion, restore impartiality and reduce lawsuits.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 403, CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 1039 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1039

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (S. 403) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1039 is a closed rule which allows one hour of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and it provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted. Finally, the rule allows one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, before we begin debate on the rule for S. 403, the Child Custody Protection Act, I want to refresh the memories of some of my colleagues and offer historical context to Members who were not here in early 2005.

Last year, on April 27, I sponsored and managed a rule to consider H.R. 748, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act. This rule passed by a vote of 234-192, including the support of eight Democrats. Two Democratic amendments were considered and failed by a recorded vote. No Republican amendments were considered to H.R. 748, and the legislation passed by a vote of 270-157, which included the support of 54 Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I once again rise in support of the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act. However, this time we will consider the legislation passed by our colleagues in the Senate. S. 403 passed the Senate by a vote of 65-34 two months ago, and it is a very close facsimile to H.R. 748. Indeed, it is almost identical to the House bill.

So, as I begin my remarks, I would like to recognize and thank Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for her dedication and leadership not only on

the House version of this legislation but also on the overall issue of protecting children.

Likewise, I would like to offer a special thank you to Senator JOHN ENSIGN of Nevada for sponsoring today's legislation and both the Senate and House leadership for their willingness to address this vital issue.

Mr. Speaker, like the debate we had in April of 2005, I anticipate that the opponents of this bill will demagogue it as an assault on a woman's so-called right to choose. Despite this allegation, S. 403 has nothing to do with Supreme Court imposed rights but simply ensures that no minor is deprived of protection by her parents under the laws of her State.

S. 403 is a common sense bill that will prohibit the transportation of a minor under age 18 across a State line to obtain an abortion when the child's home State requires parental consent. This bill makes an exception in those rare cases in which the abortion is medically necessary to save the life of the minor.

In addition, the Child Custody Protection Act affirms the responsibility of a physician prior to performing an abortion on a minor from another State to make sure that they are acting in accordance with the law. In other words, this bill not only ensures the protection of minors, but it also clarifies the responsibility of the physician to make sure that he or she is not inappropriately performing an abortion on a minor without the legally mandated consent of her parent from her home State.

The Child Custody Protection Act also affirms the principles of Federalism and it prevents the circumvention and violation of laws passed by State legislatures. Thirty-four States, let me repeat, 34 States have passed parental notification laws. In fact, in my home State of Georgia, the legislature passed a new abortion notification law just last year in overwhelming and, I might add, bipartisan fashion. Now this legislative body has the responsibility to defend that Federalism and the integrity of State laws on interstate matters.

Mr. Speaker, I can address this issue wearing three different hats. As an OB/GYN physician who has delivered many babies over the course of a 31-year medical career; as a Member of Congress; and, most importantly, as a proud father.

I have four children, three of whom are grown women and two of them with children of their own. As a father, I have an obligation to defend my children and grandchildren against danger. As a Member of this body, of Congress, I have the same obligation to the children and grandchildren of every parent in this country. As a physician, I have the obligation under the Hippocratic Oath to, in the first place, do no harm.

The Child Custody Protection Act recognizes this fundamental bond between parents and a child, and it reaffirms

the obligation of a parent to be involved and help make important decisions affecting both the life and health of a minor child.

In a society where children cannot be given aspirin at school without their parents' permission, I cannot comprehend how anyone could possibly believe that having an abortion is less traumatic than taking an aspirin. However, I understand that this is exactly what the opponents of this bill are saying through their opposition to S. 403.

During this debate I want to encourage my colleagues to remain focused on the matter at hand and remember that this legislation seeks to uphold the legislatively guaranteed rights of parents and their minor children.

I ask my colleagues, please support this rule and pass this much-needed underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow the House to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 403, the Child Custody Protection Act. It provides for only one hour of debate and, as usual, it is closed to any amendments.

I would appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as a matter of principle to vote against this rule. There is an addiction with this leadership to close processes, and it has to stop. This is not good for our democracy, this is not what this House of Representatives is about, and unless people on both sides of the aisle start coming together to vote no on these closed rules, you are going to see more and more closed rules. So let me begin by again urging all my colleagues to vote against this closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle would like us to believe that their bill only has in mind the needs of desperate and troubled teens. If that were genuinely the case, if they were indeed truly interested in children's welfare, then this House would have already passed legislation to provide America's young men and women with comprehensive pregnancy prevention and education.

As a father, I would like to think that we live in a world where incest, rape and unintended pregnancies did not occur. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, that is simply not the case. All too often, young women find themselves in difficult situations with few, if any, sympathetic people to turn to for advice.

Like all my House colleagues, I would hope that the first person to come to mind would be a parent. But, Mr. Speaker, every single Member of this Chamber knows that that is not

always the case. Research shows that at least 60 percent of minors considering an abortion freely turn to and involve their parents. Those who do not, however, are often victims of violence and have multiple reasons for not doing so. Currently, 23 States have some type of parental involvement laws, including my own State of Massachusetts. Twenty-seven do not.

This bill pretends to open the lines of communication between parents and teens, but daily we are shown examples of parents who not only may not know what is best for their child but who may themselves be part of the problem.

I am reminded of Katherine Hancock Ragsdale, a Episcopal priest from Massachusetts who spoke before the Senate Judiciary Committee in 2004. She recounted a story of a young girl who became pregnant as a result of date rape. Afraid to tell her father, the girl went to her school nurse. The nurse agreed that it was in the girl's best interests not to tell her father for fear of the girl's safety.

While driving an hour into Boston, Reverend Hancock Ragsdale chatted with the girl, who divulged that she felt very guilty about becoming pregnant. Compassionate about these feelings of guilt, the Reverend spoke with the girl about the incident. She told the priest about "a really cute boy" from her school she had met and who had asked her out. He asked her to have sex and she refused. He asked her again and again. Then he pushed her down and forced himself on her. Since he did not threaten her with a weapon or cause any bodily harm, she did not know to call it rape. She blamed herself for not knowing he wasn't a nice guy and she blamed herself for getting pregnant.

Reverend Hancock Ragsdale offered solace and advice. In her most desperate hours, this girl was able to find the comfort she so desperately needed. In addition to providing emotional support, the Reverend was able to help this girl fill out the mountains of paperwork and fill the necessary prescriptions. The advice and guidance a child would hope to receive from a parent was administered in this case by a trusted spiritual leader.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Psychological Association, the American College of Physicians all, all agree that mandatory parental consent notification can be highly detrimental to young women.

Shouldn't we be inviting the experts in health care to help us in drafting and making these recommendations and protocol? Instead, we come to the House floor under a closed rule, stand on our soapboxes, and declare that we know what is best for every single child under every single circumstance in America.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle will claim that this

bill makes improvements to the Senate bill, that this bill provides protections for victims of incest, that this bill is somehow good policy. The truth is this bill weakens an already bad Senate bill.

While it is true that the Sensenbrenner amendment would preclude an incestuous parent from suing a person who accompanies a minor to a doctor out of State for abortion care, this bill still makes it a Federal crime for anyone other than a parent to accompany a teenage incest survivor for abortion care out of State. In other words, grandma can go to jail for years just for taking her granddaughter across State lines to abort a pregnancy caused by the young girl's father, but the father can't sue the grandmother in court.

Who in this Chamber believes that a child should be forced to go forward with a pregnancy caused by her father or brother or her uncle or her stepfather? I wish I never had to think about such scenarios, but they occur all too frequently. And it would be foolish for us to compound the horror of this child by joining all the other adults who turned a blind eye to her desperate situation.

Yes, we should reduce the number of children having sex. Yes, we should reduce the number of unintended pregnancies. Yes, we should all work together to reduce the number of abortions. But this bill does not address these issues.

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason we are considering this bill one week before the House adjourns for the midterm elections: Politics. It is the political season, and anything that gets the juices flowing on the so-called hot button issues is fair game. But that is not the way we should be legislating. This isn't the first time the sensitive issue of abortion will be used for political purposes, and it won't be the last, and I urge my colleagues to reject politics as usual and defeat this closed rule.

Even if there are individuals in this House who are sympathetic in terms of supporting this bill, again, reject this rule. This habit of closing everything down, of basically locking out democracy has to end, and Members of both sides need to have the guts to stand up and vote "no" on these rules.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the rule, supporting the rule, that would move this legislation to the floor.

We have been debating this issue for a number of years, since certainly before I came to Congress in 2001, and it is a very important issue. It is an issue of respect.

My colleagues and I, many of us, served in State legislatures before we came here; and we had the opportunity

to move forward legislation that would require parental notification, parental consent before a minor girl could be subjected to the procedure called abortion.

Unfortunately, there are still some States that do not have such laws, though they are in the minority. My State of Pennsylvania is one that does have one of these laws, and the people in the Commonwealth are overwhelmingly supportive of it. Unfortunately, some neighboring States don't have these laws, and we have heard terrible stories in recent years of young girls as young as 12 brought across the border by often the perpetrator of a rape to be given an abortion, to hide the crime, to hide the relationship and, unfortunately, further providing further damage to that young girl.

What this bill would do is prevent this from happening. If a State has the requirement for parental notification or consent before a minor girl can have an abortion, then other States must respect the home State's law.

It only makes sense, Mr. Speaker, for government to respect the relationship between the parent and the child. It is most important for us to respect that relationship, because that is the relationship that will guide that girl into responsible adulthood. Currently, unfortunately, we allow many States to interject and interrupt and really disrespect that relationship.

This bill will remedy the problem. This remedy will make it a criminal offense to transport a child across the State lines for the purpose of having an abortion. In many of these cases, it has been an adult male who has exploited the teenager who then becomes pregnant and is, of course, pressuring her to get an abortion and sometimes is the one to transport her across the State lines.

The idea of doing so defies all logic. Critics argue that these young girls are in the worst possible situation, like rape or incest should be exempted from this law, that this is especially cruel to them. But these girls are in the worst situation of all, and it is certainly most important for us to protect these girls, because rape and incest could be hidden if we don't pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and in support of the bill, and I am sure my colleagues will do the same, especially now that the Senate has agreed to it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member on the House Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been standing on the floor of this House for years talking about this very issue. And thinking about what I have just heard: If a young girl 10 or 12 years old, as I understand it, was victimized by rape or incest, we should not help her to do something not to carry a child but to support her. I wish

I had time to elaborate on that further. What kind of support do you give a 10-year-old pregnant girl? What do we do for her?

But I rise today in strong opposition to this bill, because, once again, we are playing politics with women's lives. We could be spending this week before adjournment working to help Americans in real ways by raising the minimum wage, for example, or making higher education more accessible, or reducing the national debt. But, instead of doing that, this Congress could think of nothing better to do than to meddle with one of the most private decisions that women have to make in their lives.

The Child Custody Protection Act is almost exactly the same as the bill we voted on earlier in the year, and I guess it was found to be such a crowd pleaser we would like an encore. That bill, like this one, was an invasion into the private lives of American families as well as an attack on the legal rights afforded to all women in this country. We do have legal rights as women.

Not only will this bill fail to enhance the health of young women in America, it will fail to reduce the number of abortions that take place each year. It will force vulnerable young women to seek out illegal and unsafe venues for terminating pregnancies, and most of us in my generation know women who had to do that.

Now, if we really wanted to reduce unwanted pregnancies, in Congress, we could pass the Prevention First Act which is just lying around in limbo here. It would reduce the abortions by expanding teen education about preventing pregnancy and approve their access to contraception.

And this bill is not going to do anything to promote healthy families. It will criminalize grandparents. Imagine sending Granny to jail. Other caregivers are also subject to great penalties, while letting the people who committed the real crime, the rapists, the person who committed incest, they go scot free, and they can even sue the girl.

In all the years that I have spent working on behalf of women's health, I have never seen a single drop of evidence that supports this supposed epidemic we are going to talk about here today. There is no evidence that young women are being transported in great numbers across State lines for abortions.

So why are we here? Why are we here? Because this is a crowd pleaser, as I said before. It is not about protecting young women. It is gaining political points. We have a duty in this body to maximize the freedom, the quality, and the rights of our citizens, the strands that form the fabric of our society. But to toss these fundamental rights away simply to score a few points at the polls is indefensible. We can do better. I urge all the Members to oppose this bill.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am proud to yield 3 minutes to

the author of the legislation, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN).

Ms. ROSELEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule on Senate bill 403, the Child Custody Protection Act. I would like to commend Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his continued leadership on this bill throughout the years, as well as Majority Mr. Leader BOEHNER for his help in bringing this crucial legislation to the floor this morning.

Abortion is perhaps one of the most life-altering, obviously, and life-threatening of procedures. It leaves lasting medical, emotional, and psychological consequences, especially for young girls.

The Child Custody Protection Act makes it a Federal offense to transport a minor girl across State lines in order to circumvent that State's abortion parental notification or consent laws.

This legislation has passed the House of Representatives once, twice, three times; and it passed the Senate this Congress by a bipartisan vote of 65-34.

In April of 2005, this Chamber overwhelmingly passed my bill, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, CIANA. CIANA incorporates all of the provisions that were previously contained in the Child Custody Protection Act and requires that, in a State without a parental notification requirement, that abortion providers notify a parent. This important provision will be included in this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this provision and ensure that we pass a more comprehensive bill.

There are many rules and regulations in our society that work to ensure the safety of our Nation's youth through parental support, parental guidance. In most schools, an under-aged child is prohibited from attending a school field trip without first obtaining a signed permission slip from a parent or a legal guardian. I have signed many for my daughters. But the decision of whether or not to obtain an abortion, a life-changing, potentially fatal and serious medical procedure, that seems to be an exception to these rules.

As a mother of two young ladies, I want to know what is going on with my girls on something as significant and as medically life-altering as an abortion. This legislation closes a loophole that allows adults to help minors break State laws by obtaining an abortion without parental consent. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, that such a bill would even be necessary, because transporting a minor across State lines without parental permission for any other reason but to have an abortion is already a crime.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me once again in supporting this commonsense legislation and the substitute amendment to strengthen the bill to ensure that our precious children are protected and that the right of our parents are upheld.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to respond by making a couple of points.

I have heard a number of people get up here and say they strongly support a rule. How can you strongly support a closed process? How can you not be in favor of allowing Members of this House, who have various concerns about this bill and different opinions about this bill and different opinions about how we can best deal with some of these very delicate issues, how can you be proud and strongly in support of a process that says that nobody has any right to come here and make any suggestions and offer any amendments? I find that appalling. I find it appalling.

And the fact of the matter is this bill amends the Senate bill. The Senate bill was a bad bill. This makes it even worse. And somehow to claim that what we are doing is trying to make the lives of troubled teenaged girls easier in dealing with horrible circumstances, I mean, does anybody believe that a young girl who is a victim of incest or a young girl who has been raped by her stepfather or her brother is going to feel that she can go to her mother? Maybe. But, in many cases, I don't believe that is what will happen. So you are taking a tragic situation and adding more tragedy to it.

So I find that puzzling, that we have people coming to the floor telling us how this is the right thing to do and that we should somehow praise this process that closes off any amendments and any real debate. This is a bad bill, and it is a bad process under which it is coming to the floor. I don't care what you believe on the issue of choice. The fact of the matter is this notion that these bills should come to the floor under closed rules I think is just wrong.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to let the gentleman from Massachusetts know I have no other requests for time, and I will reserve for the purpose of closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me close by once again urging all Members of this House, Democrats and Republicans, to vote "no" on this rule. Vote "no" on this rule regardless of what you believe about the underlying bill, because we have a broken process in this House of Representatives.

It is wrong for a bill like this or even the previous bill, bills that are controversial, to come to this floor under a closed process. It is wrong.

□ 1200

That has become a pattern in this House of Representatives. In this Congress, with the exception of appropriation bills, every bill that has come to this floor has been under a restricted process with the exception of one open rule.

What a horrendous record. That is not good for this democracy. That does not result in good legislation. It is an

insult to all of the Members of this House, Democrat and Republican, who have good ideas who want to be able to legislate. That is what we are sent here for. If we want this to end, Members of both sides of the aisle need to stand up and have the guts to vote "no" on some of these closed rules.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, as I close this debate, I want to respond to some of the points that my good friends on the other side of the aisle have stated. They stated their concern about situations where a minor has been raped or a minor has been abused by her own parent, indeed, a case of incest and what do you want to do about that. I want to make sure that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, indeed, on both sides of the aisle understand that there are clear exceptions in this bill. And they are important. They are very important exceptions, and I don't argue with that point that is made.

Let me, Madam Speaker, enumerate a couple of those exceptions. It allows an out-of-state abortion to be performed without parental notification if it is done to save the life of the minor. And it allows an out-of-state abortion, and this is most important to that point, an out-of-state abortion to be performed where a physician is given documentation showing that the court in the minor's home State has waived parental notification requirements which certainly would be waived in those situations.

Madam Speaker, in closing, let me reemphasize the importance of Senate bill S. 403, the Child Custody Protection Act, as a safeguard of parental rights and protection for our minors. Almost 80 percent of Americans favor parental notification laws according to a poll conducted by the New York Times, yet current State laws can be circumvented and violated through the interstate transportation of minors. Allowing our children to be carted across State lines by nonguardians to get an abortion is absolutely immoral and fundamentally wrong.

I would challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and we can talk about process all day long, you have a right, but to vote against this rule and this bill is just beyond my imagination.

With over 30 States already requiring some type of parental notification, Congress cannot turn a blind eye to those who would violate the law and endanger our children.

Madam Speaker, this Congress has an obligation and a moral duty to children and to their parents to make sure State laws are upheld to prevent nonguardians from making medical decisions for our children.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, our Nation's parents and children deserve better, and this bill will ensure that they get the care and consideration that they need. Again, I would like to thank

the sponsors of this legislation, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in the House and Mr. ENSIGN in the Senate; and I want to thank all of my colleagues who support efforts to preserve the authority of parents to oversee the well-being of their own children.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: adoption of House Resolution 1038, by the yeas and nays; adoption of House Resolution 1039, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend on H.R. 5092, by the yeas and nays; motion to suspend on H.R. 4772, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2679, VETERANS' MEMORIALS, BOY SCOUTS, PUBLIC SEALS, AND OTHER PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS OF RELIGION PROTECTION ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 1038, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 177, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Bilbray	Boren
Akin	Bilirakis	Boustany
Alexander	Bishop (UT)	Bradley (NH)
Bachus	Blackburn	Brady (TX)
Baker	Blunt	Brown (SC)
Barrett (SC)	Boehler	Brown-Waite,
Bartlett (MD)	Boehner	Ginny
Barton (TX)	Bonilla	Burgess
Bass	Bonner	Burton (IN)
Berry	Bono	Buyer
Biggert	Boozman	Calvert

Camp (MI)	Hostettler
Campbell (CA)	Hulshof
Cannon	Hunter
Cantor	Hyde
Capito	Inglis (SC)
Carter	Issa
Chabot	Jenkins
Chocola	Jindal
Coble	Johnson (CT)
Cole (OK)	Johnson (IL)
Conaway	Johnson, Sam
Cramer	Jones (NC)
Crenshaw	Keller
Cubin	Kelly
Cuellar	Kennedy (MN)
Davis (KY)	King (IA)
Davis (TN)	King (NY)
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston
Davis, Tom	Kline
Deal (GA)	Knollenberg
Dent	Kolbe
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kuhl (NY)
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaHood
Doolittle	Latham
Drake	LaTourette
Dreier	Leach
Duncan	Lewis (CA)
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)
Emerson	Linder
English (PA)	LoBiondo
Everett	Lucas
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel
Ferguson	E.
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Mack
Flake	Manzullo
Foley	Marchant
Forbes	McCaul (TX)
Fortenberry	McCotter
Fossella	McCrery
Fox	McHenry
Franks (AZ)	McHugh
Frelinghuysen	McIntyre
Galleghy	McKeon
Garrett (NJ)	McMorris
Gerlach	Rodgers
Gibbons	Melancon
Gilchrest	Mica
Gillmor	Miller (FL)
Gingrey	Miller (MI)
Gohmert	Miller, Gary
Goode	Moran (KS)
Goodlatte	Murphy
Gordon	Musgrave
Granger	Neugebauer
Graves	Northup
Gutknecht	Norwood
Hall	Nunes
Harris	Nussle
Hart	Osborne
Hastings (WA)	Otter
Hayes	Paul
Hayworth	Pearce
Hefley	Pence
Hensarling	Peterson (PA)
Herger	Petri
Hobson	Pickering
Hoekstra	Pitts

NAYS—177

Abercrombie	Cleaver	Harman
Ackerman	Clyburn	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Conyers	Herseth
Andrews	Cooper	Higgins
Baca	Costa	Hinche
Baird	Costello	Holden
Baldwin	Crowley	Holt
Barrow	Cummings	Honda
Bean	Davis (AL)	Hooley
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Berkley	DeFazio	Inslee
Berman	Delahunt	Israel
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Blumenauer	Dingell	(TX)
Boswell	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Boucher	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Boyd	Edwards	Kanjorski
Brady (PA)	Emanuel	Kaptur
Brown, Corrine	Engel	Kennedy (RI)
Butterfield	Eshoo	Kildee
Capps	Etheridge	Kilpatrick (MI)
Capuano	Farr	Kind
Cardin	Filner	Kucinich
Cardoza	Frank (MA)	Langevin
Carnahan	Gonzalez	Lantos
Carson	Green, Al	Larsen (WA)
Case	Green, Gene	Larson (CT)
Chandler	Grijalva	Lee
Clay	Gutierrez	Levin

Lipinski	Owens	Skelton
Lofgren, Zoe	Pallone	Slaughter
Lowey	Pascarell	Smith (WA)
Lynch	Pastor	Snyder
Maloney	Payne	Solis
Markey	Pelosi	Spratt
Marshall	Peterson (MN)	Stark
Matheson	Pomeroy	Stupak
Matsui	Price (NC)	Tanner
McCarthy	Rahall	Tauscher
McCollum (MN)	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
McDermott	Reyes	Thompson (MS)
McGovern	Rothman	Tierney
McKinney	Roybal-Allard	Towns
McNulty	Ruppersberger	Udall (CO)
Meek (FL)	Rush	Udall (NM)
Meeks (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Michaud	Sabo	Velázquez
Miller (NC)	Salazar	Vislosky
Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman
Mollohan	T.	Schultz
Moore (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Moore (WI)	Sanders	Watson
Murtha	Schakowsky	Watt
Nadler	Schiff	Waxman
Napolitano	Schwartz (PA)	Weiner
Oberstar	Scott (GA)	Wexler
Obey	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Olver	Serrano	Wu
Ortiz	Sherman	Wynn

NOT VOTING—26

Beauprez	Ford	Millender-
Brown (OH)	Green (WI)	McDonald
Castle	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Culberson	Istook	Myrick
Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Neal (MA)
Davis (IL)	Kirk	Ney
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Oxley
Evans	Meehan	Platts
Fattah		Strickland
		Weldon (PA)

□ 1237

Messrs. KILDEE, RANGEL, BUTTERFIELD and SPRATT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SULLIVAN, CRAMER, BOREN and MCINTYRE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 474, I was delayed in traffic. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 403, CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 1039, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 157, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

YEAS—249

Aderholt	Biggert	Bono
Akin	Bilbray	Boozman
Alexander	Bilirakis	Boren
Bachus	Bishop (GA)	Boustany
Baker	Bishop (UT)	Bradley (NH)
Barrett (SC)	Blackburn	Brady (TX)
Bartlett (MD)	Boehler	Brown (SC)
Barton (TX)	Boehner	Brown, Corrine
Bass	Bonilla	Brown-Waite,
Berry	Bonner	Ginny